Objection to Drawings

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to Figure 2 of the drawings for not having the legend at the bottom of the drawing figure. In response, the Applicants propose to correct Figure 2 by inserting the legend at the bottom of the figure before allowance of the claims.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to Figures 1-3 as lacking a legend such as --Prior Art-- because, as the Examiner stated, "only that which is old is illustrated." The Examiner has not stated the specific reason(s) for the objection. Seemingly, the Examiner's reason(s) for objecting to Figures 1-3 as lacking a legend such as --Prior Art-- is because the figures are described in the "Background of the Invention" section of the Application. In response, the Applicants respectfully assert that Figures 1-3 do not necessarily represent prior art but rather the figures are submitted to facilitate the understanding of the subject matter of the invention as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.81. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the Office Action has not established a sufficient basis for the objection to Figures 1-3 and that such objection should be withdrawn.

Objection to Specification

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification for improperly incorporating subject matter into the Application by reference to co-pending applications.

In response, the Applicants amended the specification to properly incorporate subject matter into the Application by reference to co-pending applications, one of which is now U.S. Patent No. 6,230,146. The Examiner should note that during the prosecution of U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,146, the title was amended from "Method and System for Conducting Electronic Auctions" to "Method and System for Controlling Closing Times of Electronic Auctions Involving Multiple Lots" by way of an amendment filed on June 20, 2000.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

Claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74

Claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,826,244, issued to Huberman ("Huberman"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,890,137, issued to Godin et al. ("Godin").

The Examiner states that Huberman discloses a method, system, and computer program product on a computer useable medium of conducting an electronic online auction between a plurality of potential bidders. The Examiner further states that Huberman discloses multiple bid information, which is received for a lot from multiple bidders. More specifically, the Examiner explains that in Huberman, the received first bid information represents a first bid that is originally defined in a context of the first bidder, the information reflective of said submitted bid is stored, and the stored information enables a relative comparison of submitted bids on a common competitive basis.

However, the Examiner states that Huberman does not disclose second bid information that is defined in a context of a second bidder that is different than said context of said first bidder to said second bidder and transmitted, thus enabling said second bidder to view or display a bid originally defined in a context of said first bidder in said context of said second bidder.

In regard to Godin, the Examiner states that Godin discloses context differences and transmitting the differences. The Examiner also states that it would have been obvious to apply what is disclosed by Godin to Huberman because Godin teaches the importance of changing dynamics inherent to the auction process such that a bid must be viewed in context.

In response, the Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are allowable over the references cited by the Examiner because the "three-prong test," which must be met for a reference or a combination of references to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, has not been satisfied in the instant matter. The MPEP states, in relevant part:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

> Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

MPEP § 2142.

The Applicants respectfully assert that none of these criteria have been met. There was no suggestion or motivation, either in Huberman or in Godin, to receive a bid originally defined in one context and redefine the bid in another context, as required by the amended claims of the present invention. More particularly, Huberman and Godin do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, enabling of a second bidder to view a bid originally defined in a context of a first bidder in a context of the second bidder. Nor is there any mention in Huberman and Godin, either alone or in combination, of transforming bid information from one context to another context. Indeed, there is no mention whatsoever in either Huberman or Godin of using bids in two or more contexts, each of which can be different from one another, or transforming bids from one context to another. Accordingly, there is no suggestion or motivation in Huberman and Godin to arrive, either alone or in combination, at the subject matter of amended claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74.

Furthermore, there would not have been a reasonable expectation of success that modifying the teachings of Huberman would arrive at the subject matter of claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74 as amended. This is because the method and system of providing a document service over a computer network using an automated brokered auction, as taught by Huberman, would not have made obvious the teachings of the present invention. Huberman discloses an auction system, wherein multiple suppliers/printers compete to win an award of providing document service to a buyer/customer. See, col. 3, lines 41-58. Nowhere in the disclosure does Huberman teach or suggest a bidder using a bid defined in one context that is different from a context of another bidder. Thus, there could be no reasonable expectation of success that modifying Huberman, which does not teach or suggest transforming (or redefining) a bid originally defined in one context to another, would arrive at enabling a bidder to view a bid originally defined in a context of a first bidder in a context of a second bidder, as required in amended claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74 of the Application.

Moreover, Huberman and Godin do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, all of the claim limitations of claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74. MPEP §

2143.03 specifically instructs that "[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." More specifically, the Applicants respectfully assert that Huberman and Godin do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, enabling of a bidder to view a bid originally defined in a context of a first bidder in a context of a second bidder, as required in claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74 as amended.

Amended claim 1 is directed at a method of conducting an electronic online auction between a plurality of potential bidders, where the plurality of potential bidders compete for a lot having at least one product. The method comprises the steps of receiving first bid information for a lot from a first bidder, said received first bid information representing a first bid that is originally defined in a context of said first bidder, storing information reflective of said submitted first bid, said stored information enabling a relative comparison of submitted bids including said first bid on a common competitive basis, and transmitting second bid information defined in a context of a second bidder that is different than said context of said first bidder to said second bidder, said transmitted second bid information enabling said second bidder to view said first bid originally defined in said context of said first bidder in said context of said second bidder.

The Applicants respectfully assert that Huberman and Godin do not show, either alone or in combination, all of the features underlined in the paragraph set forth above. Huberman discloses a system and method of facilitating an electronically networked auction for the document services industry. Col. 2, lines 54-64. The purpose of Huberman was to provide "[a] better way to establish prices for document services." Col. 2, lines 50-51. In a specific embodiment, suppliers of document services bid competitively on a request for document services to a broker, who auctions the job off to the lowest bidder at the lowest price. Col. 3, lines 52-61. The broker informs the customer of the winning supplier and price and the customer then decides whether to accept the winning bid. Col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 4.

Criteria other than or in addition to low prices can also be used to select the winning bid. Col. 11, lines 44-46. This criteria may be used when (i) the broker offers the customer a choice of several possible winners based on several lowest bids at the lowest prices and (ii) the broker screens bids above a reservation or maximum price. Col. 4, lines 7-15. However,

the use of criteria does not enable a relative comparison of bids in different contexts, as required by amended claim 1 of the Application. Thus, while Huberman may suggest a comparison of bids among suppliers using one or more criteria (col. 11, lines 35-50), it does not teach or suggest transforming (or redefining) a bid originally defined in one context into another context, thereby allowing a bidder to view and compare the bid originally defined in another bidder's context, which may be different from that of the bidder.

Godin discloses "a method of auctioning products on-line where participants use computer terminals to access a computer site and participate." Col. 1, lines 58-60. The method comprises auctioning products on-line at the designated time by setting a fixed time period for completing the auction, thereby providing dynamic feedback to potential purchasers during the auction. Col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 14. In particular, Godin discloses the web server computers 10 and 12 having various applications, not context differences, that can be used to retrieve data from the database server 22. Col. 5, lines 41-45. The web server can, using the various applications, obtain information from a database server and then merge the information with the appropriate product images and templates and present the appropriate information to the user. Col. 5, lines 53-59.

Godin neither teaches nor suggests using context differences, as suggested by the Examiner. As explained in the specification of the Application, multi-parameter bids, including non-price parameters are transformed into comparable units of measure, or different contexts. See, Application, p.9, lines 7-27. Comparative bid parameters are used to compare competing bids in different contexts. See, Application, p.10, line 26 – p.11, line 2. In contrast, Godin merely suggests using various applications in a computer web server, where a user's request determines what applications are used to retrieve data from the database server 22. Col. 5, lines 43-46. Godin does not allow multi-parameter bids and requires no transformation into comparable units of measure. The use of various applications is not the same as using context differences, as required by amended claim 1 of the Application.

Furthermore, while Godin suggests that it is important to expose the user to changing dynamics, it neither teaches nor suggests the application of changing dynamics such that a bid must be viewed in a context. See, col. 6, lines 37-50. Rather, Godin discloses a system where common parameters or units (i.e., current price and current quantity) are updated

frequently to reflect the current auction process, thereby creating a dynamic environment that may exist in a traditional auction system. Id. The Applicants respectfully assert that showing changes in price and/or quantity is not same as or equivalent to defining a bid originally defined in one context into another context, as required by amended claim 1 of the Application.

In sum, Huberman and Godin do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, all of the claim limitations of claim 1 as amended. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest or motivate one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Huberman to arrive at the present invention, nor would there have been any reasonable expectation of success in doing so. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

It is also respectfully submitted that while the Applicants traverse the 103(a) rejection as explained above, the claims are amended herein to clarify that the first bid received is defined in the first bidder's context, which is different from the second bidder's context. That is, in accordance with one aspect of the claimed invention, the first bid of the first bidder is originally defined in a context that may be unique to the first bidder. The received first bid is then defined (or redefined) in another context that is different from the first bidder's context. The method of claim 1 as amended, for instance, facilitates a comparison of two or more bids, each of which may be originally defined in a unique context, by defining (or redefining) the bids into another context. Thus, the second bidder, as claimed in claim 1 as amended, may view the first bid, which was originally defined in the first bidder's context, in its own context, thereby allowing a relative comparison of the first bid to its own bid. These features form the basis of limitations in claim 1 as amended. Likewise, amended claims 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74 include the same limitations.

Claims 2-20, 22-40, 42-65, 67, 68, 71, and 75

Claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 23, 29, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 48, 52, 58, 61, 65, and 75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Godin in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,243,515, issued to Lee. Claims 6, 16, 26, 36, 45, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Godin in further view of Lee as applied to claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 23, 29, 31, 32, 39,

42, 43, 48, 52, 58, 61, and 75 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,502, issued to Gell et al. Claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 46, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Godin in further view of Lee as applied claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 23, 29, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 48, 52, 58, 61, 65, and 75 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,992,940, issued to Dworkin. Claims 8, 18, 28, 38, 47, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Godin in further view of Lee as applied to claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 23, 29, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 48, 52, 58, 61, 65, and 75 above, and further in view of Gell et al. and Dworkin. Claims 4, 10, 13, 14, 20, 24, 30, 33, 34, 40, 44, 53, 54, 59, 63, 67, and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Godin in further view of Lee as applied to claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 23, 29, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 48, 52, 58, 61, 65, and 75 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,402, issued to Popolo. Claims 5, 15, 25, 35, 50, 60, 64, and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Godin in further view of Lee as applied to claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 23, 29, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 48, 52, 58, 61, 65, and 75 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,637,464, issued to Walsh et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,794,207, issued to Walker et al. Claim 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Godin in further view of Lee as applied to claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 22, 23, 29, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 48, 52, 58, 61, 65, and 75 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,807, issued to Schirripa.

Claims 61-65, 67, 68 and 75 are withdrawn by way of this amendment. Claims 2-20, 22-40, 42-60, and 71 depend from independent claims 1, 21, 41, and 69, respectively, which the Applicants respectfully assert, for the reasons noted above, are patentable over Huberman in view of Godin. Also, the additional cited prior art does not disclose any of the limitations that are not disclosed in Huberman and Godin, as indicated above, but are required in claims 1, 21, 41, and 69. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 2-20, 22-40, 42-60, and 71 are allowable because such claims depend from an allowable base claim.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

In paragraph 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-65, 67-69, and 71-75 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-65, 67-69, and 71-75 of co-pending Application No. 09/282,156 (the "'156 Application"), which is assigned to

the same entity as the Application. More specifically, in paragraph 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that current pending claims in the '156 Application do not include net present value bids, as argued by the Applicants previously.

In response, the Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the amendment filed on April 24, 2002 in the '156 Application. In the amendment of the '156 Application, claims 1-64, 66-68, and 70-74 have been deleted, claims 65 and 69 have been amended and claims 76-83 have been added. Thus, only claims 65, 69, and 76-83 should be considered with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The Applicants respectfully assert that each one of the current pending claims in the '156 Application, as amended, includes net present value bids as a limitation. For instance, claim 65 as amended recites, in relevant parts, that "...said net present value bid representing a sum of a series of payments over a plurality of contract term segments..." Likewise, claim 69 as amended recites, in relevant parts, that "...said net present value bid representing a sum of a series of payments over a plurality of contract term segments..." Furthermore, newly added independent claims 76 and 80 also include "net present value bid" as a limitation. Independent claim 76 recites, in relevant parts, that "...transmitting net present value bid information to a plurality of bidders, said net present value bid information enabling a plurality of bidders to view net present value bids submitted by a plurality of bidders." Likewise, independent claim 80 recites, in relevant parts, that "...said net present value bid information enabling a plurality of bidders to view net present value bids submitted by a plurality of bidders." In addition, claims 77-79 and 81-83 depend on claims 76 and 80, respectively.

According to MPEP § 804(II)(A), "identical subject matter" must be claimed in both applications for a statutory double patenting rejection to be appropriate. Furthermore, a reliable test "for double patenting under 35 U.S.C. 101 is whether a claim in the application could be literally infringed without literally infringing a corresponding claim in the [other application]. *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970)."

In light of the amendments made in the '156 Application, the Applicants respectfully assert that the each and every one of the claims pending in the '156 application includes the net present value limitation, which is not found in any claims of the Application. That is,

none of the current pending claims in the present Application (i.e., claims 1-60, 69, and 71-74) includes a literal or equivalent limitation of "net present value."

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully assert that, in light of the amendments made in the '156 Application, the Examiner's argument that the '156 Application does not include net present value bid is no longer valid and therefore moot, and that rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that pending independent claims 1, 21, 41, 69, 72, 73, and 74 are in condition for allowance. In addition, it is submitted that dependent claims 2-20, 22-40, 42-60, and 71 are allowable, because such claims depend from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-60, 69, and 71-74 are requested.

Furthermore, the Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced into the amendments presented herein. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections presented in the Office Action mailed June 5, 2002 and passage to allowance of all pending claims at an early date are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 215-963-4753 to discuss any matter concerning this Application.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. §1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this Application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 5, 2002

By: _____
Kim R. Jessum
Reg. No. 43,694
Customer No. 028977
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
Telephone: (215) 963-4753
Facsimile: (215) 963-5299

Marked-up Version under 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 (C)(1)

In the Specification:

Please replace the paragraph starting from page 8, line 27 through page 9, line 2 with the following:

> Reference will now be made in detail to the preferred embodiments of the present invention, examples of which are illustrated in the accompanying drawings. The present invention described below extends the operation of the inventive auction system and method described in greater detail in [co-pending Application No. _____, entitled "Method and System for Conducting Electronic Auctions," filed February 19, 1999,] co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 09/252,790, entitled "Method and System for Controlling Closing Times of Electronic Auctions Involving Multiple Lots", filed February 19, 1999, now U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,146, issued May 8, 2001, the disclosure of which is hereby expressly incorporated in the present application.

Please replace the paragraph of page 11, lines 11-22 with the following:

> Alternatively, the transformation process can use multiple non-comparative bid parameters to create a buyer comparative bid parameter. In this case, no supplier comparative bid parameters are used to create supplier specific views. All parties view the competition in the same context. An example of this scenario is net present value (NPV) bidding, where parameters specifying multi-year contracts are converted into a total NPV bid. The total NPV bid represents a sum of a series of payments over multiple contract years, which are discounted to a present value using a predefined discount rate structure. NPV bidding is described in co-pending [U.S. Application No. _____,] U.S. Patent Application No. 09/282,156, entitled "Method and System for Conducting Electronic Auctions with Net Present Value Bidding," filed [concurrently herewith,] March 31, 1999, the disclosure of which is hereby expressly incorporated in the present application.

Please replace the paragraph of page 18, lines 10-17 with the following.

Another example of transformation bidding is multi-currency bidding. Multi-currency bidding is an auction format wherein the buyer views all submitted bids in a base currency (e.g., U.S. dollars), while each of the suppliers view all submitted bids in a local currency (e.g., Japanese Yen, Swiss Francs, etc.). Multi-currency bidding is described in co-pending [U.S. Application No. ___,] U.S. Patent Application No. 09/282,158, entitled "Method and System for Conducting Electronic Auctions with Multi-Currency Bidding," filed [concurrently herewith,] March 31, 1999, the disclosure of which is hereby expressly incorporated in the present application.

In the Claims:

1. (Twice Amended) A method of conducting an electronic online auction between a plurality of potential bidders, the plurality of potential bidders competing for a lot having at least one product, comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving first bid information for a lot from a first bidder, said received first bid information representing a first bid that is originally defined in a context of said first bidder;

(b) storing information reflective of said submitted first bid, said stored information enabling a relative comparison of submitted bids, including said first bid, on a common competitive basis; and

(c) transmitting second bid information defined in a context of a second bidder that is different than said context of said first bidder to said second bidder, said transmitted second bid information enabling said second bidder to view said first bid originally defined in said context of said first bidder [a bid originally defined in a context of said first bidder] in said context of said second bidder.

21. (Twice Amended) A system for conducting an electronic online auction between a plurality of potential bidders, the plurality of potential bidders competing for a lot having at least one product, comprising:

means for receiving first bid information for a lot from a first bidder, said received first bid information representing a first bid that is originally defined in a context of said first bidder;

means for storing information reflective of said submitted first bid, said stored information enabling a relative comparison of submitted bids including said first bid on a common competitive basis; and

means for transmitting second bid information defined in a context of a second bidder that is different than said context of said first bidder to said second bidder, said transmitted second bid information enabling said second bidder to view said first bid originally defined in said context of said first bidder [a bid originally defined in a context of said first bidder] in said context of said second bidder.

41. (Amended) A method of participating in an electronic online auction between a plurality of potential bidders, the plurality of potential bidders competing for a lot having at least one product, comprising the steps of:

(a) transmitting first bid information for a lot to an auction server, said transmitted first bid information representing a first bid that is originally defined in a context of a first bidder, said transmitted first bid information being used by the auction server in a comparison of said first bid with other submitted bids, said other submitted bids originally defined in contexts different from said context of said first bidder;

(b) receiving second bid information from said auction server, said received second bid information representing a second bid that was submitted by a second bidder, said second bid being originally defined in a context different from said context of said first bidder; and

(c) using said received second bid information to display a relative comparison of said first bid and said second bid [in a context of said first bidder.], said relative comparison shown in said context of said first bidder.

69. (Twice Amended) A method of participating in an electronic online auction including a plurality of participants, wherein the participants include a sponsor and at least two potential bidders, the potential bidders competing for award of a lot, comprising:

(a) receiving bid information including a bid from a first bidder, said bid information including said bid defined in a first context [from a first bidder for said lot]; and

(b) redefining said bid information including said bid to a second context that differs from said first context; and

(c) comparing said [transformed] redefined bid information to other bid information on a common competitive basis.

72. (Twice Amended) A computer program product for enabling a processor in a computer system to process bidding information in an auction between a plurality of bidders, said computer program product comprising:

a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code embodied in said medium for causing an application program to execute on the computer system, said computer readable program code comprising

a first computer readable program code enabling the computer system to transmit first bid information for a lot having at least one product to an auction server, said transmitted first bid information representing a first bid that is originally defined in a context of a first bidder, said transmitted first bid information being used by the auction server in a comparison of said first bid with other submitted bids, said other submitted bids originally defined in contexts different from said context of said first bidder;

a second computer readable program code enabling the computer system to receive second bid information from said auction server, said received

second bid information representing a second bid that was submitted by a second bidder, said second bid being originally defined in a context of said second bidder that is different from said context of said first bidder; and

a third computer readable program code enabling the computer system to display a relative comparison of said first bid and said second bid in a context of said first bidder.

73. (Twice Amended) A computer program product for enabling a processor in a computer system to process bidding information in an auction between a plurality of bidders, said computer program product comprising:

a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code embodied in said medium for causing an application program to execute on the computer system, said computer readable program code comprising

a first computer readable program code enabling the computer system to receive bid information including a bid from a bidder for a lot;

a second computer readable program code enabling the computer system to generate a transformed bid using [at least] said bid information including said bid; and

a third computer readable program code enabling the computer system to said transmit transformed bid [information] to an auction server, said transformed bid [information] being used by [enabling] said auction server to generate a relative comparison of bids on a common competitive basis, said bids originally defined in at least two different bidder-specific contexts[, on a common competitive basis].

74. (Twice Amended) A computer program product for enabling a processor in a computer system to process bidding information in an auction between a plurality of bidders, said computer program product comprising:

a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code embodied in said medium for causing an application program to execute on the computer system, said computer readable program code comprising

a first computer readable program code enabling the computer system to receive first bid information for a lot having at least one product from a first bidder, said received first bid information representing a first bid that is originally defined in a context of said first bidder;

a second computer readable program code enabling the computer system to store information reflective of said submitted first bid, said stored information enabling a relative comparison of submitted bids including said first bid on a common competitive basis; and

a third computer readable program code for enabling the computer system to transmit second bid information defined in a context of a second bidder that is different than said context of said first bidder to said second bidder, said transmitted second bid information enabling said second bidder to view said first bid originally defined in said context of said first bidder [a bid originally defined in said context of said first bidder] in said context of said second bidder.